



PROPOSING OFFICIAL'S RATIONALE WORKSHEET

EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

Employee name	Click here to enter text.	Hire Date	Click here to enter a date.
Job Title	Click here to enter text.	Grade	Click here to enter text.

CHARGE NO. [Choose an item.](#)

[Provide cause here \(copied from proposal letter\).](#)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR EVALUATING THE DOUGLAS FACTORS

As an official proposing corrective or adverse action, you are required to determine the appropriate remedial action by considering the factors outlined in Section 1606.2 of Chapter 16 of the D.C. personnel regulations, Corrective and Adverse Actions; Enforced Leave; and Grievances. These factors are known as the *Douglas* Factors and refers to criteria that supervisors must consider in determining an appropriate penalty to impose for an act of employee misconduct. The *Douglas* Factors were established by the federal Merit Systems Protection Board in its landmark decision, *Douglas v. Veterans Administration*, 5 M.S.P.R. 280 (1981). The reasoning and factors established in *Douglas* were adopted by the D.C. Court of Appeals in *Stokes v. District of Columbia*, 502 A.2d 1006 (D.C. 1985). Your analysis of these factors will be considered part of the official record and, should the employee appeal the final agency decision, you could be asked to testify about your analysis.

Each of the factors should be considered in light of the facts and circumstances presented in the proposed notice and supporting documents.

1. For each factor, you should determine whether the factor is aggravating, mitigating, or has had no impact (is neutral) in the formulation of your decision.
2. Write a brief explanation for each factor you determine to be aggravating or mitigating—particularly with respect to those factors you consider "aggravating."

DEFINITIONS

- AGGRAVATING: to make more severe, intense, serious, worse or grave.
- NEUTRAL: neither a contributing nor detracting factor; not applicable
- MITIGATING: to make less severe, intense

DOUGLAS FACTORS

1. Nature and Seriousness of Conduct

Briefly describe the nature and seriousness of the conduct, and its relationship to the employee's duties:

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

2. Job Level and Employment Type

- ☐ Employee is a supervisor or manager
- ☐ Employee holds a position of trust
- ☐ Conduct involved public contact (e.g. rude to customers)
- ☐ Conduct directly related to job (e.g. supply clerk stealing supplies)

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

3. Past Corrective or Adverse Actions (including Reprimands)

List all prior reprimands, corrective actions, and adverse actions you are considering in your analysis. This only includes official actions taken within the past 3 years, as reflected in the Official Personnel File. Verbal counseling and other informal records should not be listed in this section.

<u>Effective Date</u>	<u>Corrective or Adverse Action Effectuated</u>
1 Effective Date	Corrective or Adverse Action Effectuated
2 Effective Date	Corrective or Adverse Action Effectuated

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

4. Employees' Work Record

Years with agency	Click to enter number of years	Years with District	Click to enter number of years
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------

Performance Ratings for the last three years:

Rating period:	Click to enter fiscal year	Rating:	Click to enter overall rating
Rating period:	Click to enter fiscal year	Rating:	Click to enter overall rating
Rating period:	Click to enter fiscal year	Rating:	Click to enter overall rating

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

5. Confidence in Employee

- ☐ Conduct impacts employee's ability to do job (e.g. cannot do job while AWOL)
- ☐ Conduct undermines confidence in employee's ability to do job (e.g. timekeeping submitted fraudulent time for self)
- ☐ Conduct undermines confidence in employee's ability to uphold agency mission

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

6. Consistency of Action

- ☐ No other employee under my supervision have engaged in this conduct
- ☐ The proposed action is consistent with actions taken against other employees under my supervision for similar conduct
- ☐ The proposed penalty is NOT consistent with that applied to other employees, but is warranted. **(Explain in detail below)**

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

7. Consistency with Table of Illustrative Actions

Cause	Click here to enter text.	Offense No.	Click here to enter text.
Table Description	Description from table.	Listed Action	Remedy from table.

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

8. Impact on Agency Reputation / Notoriety

Did or could the employee's conduct adversely impact on the agency's reputation or undermine the public's confidence in the agency? If so, please explain.

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

9. Clarity of Notice to Employee of Unacceptable Conduct

Was the employee aware that their actions or behavior were not appropriate? If so, how were they aware (meeting, email, policy issuance, prior counseling, prior discipline)? Additionally, should they have known without being told? If so, why?

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

10. Potential for Employee's Rehabilitation

How likely is it that the employee will engage in similar conduct in the future? (Did the employee immediately acknowledge their misconduct, or were they evasive? Was the employee remorseful?)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

11. Mitigating Circumstances

The employee was:

- ☐ Under unusual job stress (e.g. contributing to insubordination)
- ☐ Experiencing personal problems
- ☐ Provoked (e.g. coworker threatened employee)
- ☐ Apologetic
- ☐ Forthright, bringing the conduct to management's attention

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

12. Adequacy of Alternative Actions

- ☐ **No lesser action** will deter similar future conduct by the employee
- ☐ **A lesser action** could deter similar future conduct by the employee

This factor is [Choose consideration type.](#)

[Click here to enter explanation.](#)

Proposed Action

No.	Cause	Proposed Action
Click here to enter text.	Click here to enter text.	CLICK HERE TO ENTER TEXT.

By signing this form, you confirm that you reviewed and considered the preceding factors and that you conclude the above proposed action is reasonable and appropriate to the circumstances.

Proposing Official

Date